

Accountability Work Group

Dec. 1 meeting

NOTES

In attendance: Tim Mitchell, Kevin Nelson, Kim Bellum, David Owen, Greg Talcott, Lyn Heidenson, Wade Pogany, Darrell Mueller, Guy Johnson (for John Pedersen), Christina Schultz, Sandy Arsenault, Susan Turnipseed, Kyle Cumbow, Margo Heinert, Jacquelyn Sly, Becky Guffin, Ann Smith (for Pam Homan), Curt Voight, Paul Turman

Q&A with Secretary Schopp

Q: Why are we applying for a waiver?

A: We believe this will happen eventually. This is our opportunity to shape the agenda. Taking leadership to move forward, rather than waiting for something to happen to us.

Q: What is the biggest concern about the application process that you are hearing?

A: The teacher/principal evaluation piece, and in particular, the instruments used to do the evaluation.

One of the superintendents added that a recent survey of superintendents showed that the majority of them support moving forward with waiver. But that the "devil is in the details."

Q: Is the state completely committed to moving forward?

A: We are committed but will need to base some decisions on public comment received on proposed plan as well.

Q: Will there be legislation related to some of these pieces?

A: Let's not talk about the unknown. Let's concentrate on what we do know and moving forward.

Overview of the Proposed Model (Secretary Schopp)

- School Performance Index
- Based on 100 points
- Currently five indicators on the Index
- Two Indexes: One for high school and one for elementary/middle schools
- Under the system, every school has its own goal and targets based on its own starting point
- Explanation of the bell curve/standard deviation model (page 3 of summary document)

QUESTIONS:

--Could we apply the Index just to schools and not the district?

--Could we have less requirement for growth the higher you score on the Index?

--May need to talk about the amount of the standard deviation (is it 1/4 or 1/8 or 1/16?) Worth more discussion when we have more data.

--Concern about those schools above proficiency point and the fact that they cannot grow as much

--What happens when schools restructure?

Review of Indicator #1: Student Achievement

- Based on students scoring proficient and advanced on statewide assessment – grades 3-8 and 11 – reading and math
- NEW: Using a Gap Group and unduplicated count
- Unduplicated count is an aggregate count of students that have had highest achievement gaps over period of several years
- Change the N size to 10
- Under Indicator #1, no specific bar/goal for performance, but do use the below basic, basic, proficient and advanced categories
- Still report out all of the subgroups but use the Gap Group for accountability calculation

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:

--Could we do the Gap Group by percentage of students rather than a straight 50-50 weighting?

--We've got to make sure this is equitable from school to school

DECISION POINTS:

1) What groups are in Gap Group?

Answer:

- Black
- Native American
- Hispanic
- Economically Disadvantaged
- Migrant
- Students with Disabilities
- Limited English Proficient Students

2) How to weight the Gap and Non-Gap Groups? Based on number of students in each group or a 50-50 weighting, or something else?

RECOMMENDATION: DOE should run numbers to see how they play out. Group stressed that it should be equitable.

3) N size of 10?

Yes

CONSENSUS BUILDING VOTE:

--OK overall with concepts of Gap and Non-Gap Group, which students in Gap Group, and N size of 10?

11 -- Yes

6 -- Maybe (Message: Need to clarify the weighting process of Gap vs. Non-Gap)

0 -- No

Review of Indicator #2: Academic Growth

- State pursuing whole suite of assessment tools – interim, formative, etc.
- Since proper tools to measure growth are not available currently at high school level, state not recommending Growth calculation at high school level.
- State pursuing two options for Growth calculation at elementary/middle school level:
 - 1) Transition Table model -- points assigned for growth from one proficiency level to next (or within proficiency levels)
 - 2) Value Added/Linear Regression model – considers expected growth and then accounts for various background characteristics

QUESTIONS regarding Transition Table model:

--Are we pushing kids enough at the top end? Should we change the point system for those on the higher end?

-- Is there a difference in the Dakota STEP at the different grade levels? Complexity of test has the potential to impact this model.

--Could we subtract points for students? Right now, example doesn't allow.

QUESTIONS:

--Does the value added model offer excuses for our students?

CONSENSUS BUILDING VOTE:

Which model do you prefer?

--6 in favor of Value Added/Linear Regression model

--8 in favor of Transition Table model

--Definite consensus on using some sort of growth model

RECOMMENDATION: DOE should run numbers through both models to compare.

Review of Indicator #3: Attendance (elem/middle school) or College/Career Readiness (high school)

- Attendance rate used at elementary and middle school levels for this indicator

CONSENSUS BUILDING VOTE:

Use Attendance as only factor for elementary/middle school for this Indicator?

--12 Yes

CONSENSUS BUILDING VOTE:

What factors should be included at high school level for this Indicator?

--Graduation rate: 16 Yes

--Dropout rate: 6 Yes; 10 No

--Postsecondary participation and/or employed or military: 11 Yes; 2 No

--Progress toward credit accumulation: 6 Yes; 3 Maybe; 8 No

-- ACT/Work Keys combination: 17 Yes

-- GPA: 7 Yes ; 6 No

--Attendance: 1 Yes; 15 No

--Personal Learning Plan/MyLife: 1 Yes; 9 No

Review of Indicator #4 – Teacher and Principal Effectiveness

- Indicator not in place until 2014-15, as much work to be done
- Assessments would need to be developed
- Rules/guidelines put in place, with input from field
- Basic framework – evaluation based partly on teacher/principal evaluation and partly on student performance

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS:

- Can we call it Effective Teachers and Principals, not Effective Teachers and Leaders?
- Not enough details to know how to vote on this
- How do we tie in the non-core people?
- Concerns about what proper measurement is?
- How do we assess areas such as PE or music?
- Does Student Performance have to mean assessment/test?
- Would the department have to develop some standards-related assessments, or could districts do that?

CONSENSUS BUILDING VOTE

How would you weight the two measurements of this Indicator: Evaluation and Student Performance?

Range of answers:

- 95% evaluation and 5% student performance
- 90% evaluation and 10% student performance (2x)
- 80% evaluation and 20% student performance
- 75% evaluation and 25% student performance (2x)
- 70% evaluation and 30% student performance (2x)
- 60% evaluation and 40% student performance
- 55% evaluation and 45% student performance
- 25% evaluation and 75% student performance

Review of Indicator #5 – Healthy Schools

- Indicator attempts to identify other factors in a school that make it a good school – school that is safe, welcoming, etc.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

- More indicators we have, the better chance of showing growth
- Seems to be “fluffy”
- How about points for discipline referrals?
- It should not be included as an indicator.
- Difficult to measure

CONSENSUS BUILDING VOTE

Should Healthy Schools, as presented be an indicator?

VOTE: 8 No; 3 Yes; 3 Maybe

- What about changing title of this Indicator to School Climate and base it on data such as a Student/Parent Survey?

Make it more about organizational health:

- Learning Environment
- School Climate
- Health/Wellness
- Parent Involvement
- Parent Teacher Conferences
- Student Surveys

CONSENSUS BUILDING VOTE

--Should we use a School Climate Indicator as measured by a survey instead of Healthy Schools Indicator?

7 Yes

3 Maybe

4 No

Group members also offered written recommendations on points for each Indicator.

High School Performance Index

INDICATOR	2012-13 & 2013-14 HOW MANY POINTS?	2014-15 HOW MANY POINTS?
1) Student Achievement	30-75 points	20-40 points
2) Academic Growth	NO POINTS UNTIL 2014-15	15-40 points
3) College & Career Ready	25-55 points	10-40 points
4) Effective Teachers & Leaders	NO POINTS UNTIL 2014-15	10-30 points
5) School Climate	0-20 points	0-10 points
	TOTAL OF 100 POINTS	TOTAL OF 100 POINTS

Elementary and Middle School Performance Index

INDICATOR	2012-13 & 2013-14 HOW MANY POINTS?	2014-15 HOW MANY POINTS?
1) Student Achievement	30-50 points	20-40 points
2) Academic Growth	25-60 points	15-40 points
3) Attendance	5-30 points	5-30 points
4) Effective Teachers & Leaders	NO POINTS UNTIL 2014-15	10-30 points
5) School Climate	0-15 points	0-10 points
	TOTAL OF 100 POINTS	TOTAL OF 100 POINTS

OTHER NOTES:

--Should we be using the term "Gap Group." Does it have negative connotations?

--Is there anything we can do with the 5-year grad rate and how special education students fall within that model?